REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the final Office Action mailed January 17, 2007. In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that claims 18-21, 23-24 and 26-29 are pending and rejected. By this response, Applicants have amended claims 18 and 28. Arguments refuting the Examiner's position are provided below.

In view of both the amendments presented above and the following discussion, Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the respective provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103.

It is to be understood that Applicants, by amending the claims, do not acquiesce to the Examiner's characterizations of the art of record or to Applicants' subject matter recited in the pending claims. Further, Applicants are not acquiescing to the Examiner's statements as to the applicability of the art of record to the pending claims by filing the instant response including amendments.

Rejections

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 18-19, 21, 23-24, and 26-29

The Examiner has rejected claims 18-19, 21, 23-24, and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanaya et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,591,009, hereinafter "Hanaya") in view of White (U.S. Patent No. 5,596,373, hereinafter "White"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In general, Hanaya teaches a method for displaying program guide data. As taught in Hanaya, a digital broadcast signal including compressed video data and compressed audio data, as well as program guide data, is received. The signal is demultiplexed and a display processor processes the program guide data so as to display a program guide window containing a number of program names. (Hanaya, Abstract).

Hayana, however, fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claim 18, as a whole. Namely, Hayana fails to teach or suggest at least the limitations of "wherein at least one of the sets of slices includes a plurality of slices associated with the respective plurality

of slice locations in the guide region, wherein multiple slices for each of the at least one slice location are received in different ones of the sets of slices," as claimed in Applicants' claim 18. Specifically, Applicants' claim 18 recites:

> 18. A method for providing a user interface having included therein a plurality of regions, the method comprising:
>
> receiving a bitstream comprising packets for a plurality of slices for a guide region of the user interface, wherein the guide region includes a plurality of slice locations, wherein each slice is designated for presentation at a particular slice location in the guide region, wherein multiple slices are received for each of at least one slice location in the guide region, wherein the slices are received as a plurality of sets of slices, wherein at least one of the sets of slices includes a plurality of slices associated with the respective plurality of slice locations in the guide region, wherein multiple slices for each of the at least one slice location are received in different ones of the sets of slices;
>
> retrieving from the bitstream packets for a first one of the sets of slices for the guide region;
>
> decoding the retrieved packets for the first one of the sets of slices to form the guide region of the user interface;
>
> retrieving from the bitstream packets for a second one of the sets of slices for the guide region; and
>
> decoding the retrieved packets for the second one of the sets of slices to update at least one of the slice locations of the guide region of the user interface.
>
> [Emphasis added.]

In other words, Applicants' claim 18 indicates that a bitstream is received, the received bitstream including packets for a plurality of slices for a guide region of a user interface, where each slice is designated for presentation at a particular slice location in the guide region. As claimed in Applicants' claim 18, the slices are received as multiple sets of slices such that multiple slices are received for each of at least one slice location in the guide region. As further claimed in Applicants' claim 18, at least one of the sets of slices includes a plurality of slices associated with the respective slice locations in the guide region, and, further, multiple slices for each of the at least one slice location are received in different ones of the sets of slices.

By contrast, Hayana merely teaches that data of an electronic program guide (EPG) is provided to a set-top terminal in a format including channel data and program data. As taught in Hayana, EPG channel data is organized into channel segments and EPG program data associated with channel data is organized into program segments,

and the channel data segments and program data segments are packetized and then transmitted to the set-top terminal. (Hayana, Col. 9, Lines 28 – 47).

Hayana, however, is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of the sets of slices as claimed in Applicants' claim 18. Specifically, Hayana fails to teach or suggest that at least one of the sets of slices includes a plurality of slices associated with respective slice locations. Furthermore, Hayana fails to teach or suggest that, for each of the at least one slice location for which multiple slices are received, the multiple slices are received in different ones of the sets of slices.

In the Office Action, the Examiner cites a specific portion of Hayana as teaching Applicants' limitation that the slices are received as multiple sets of slices. Specifically, the Examiner cites Figure 12 of Hayana, asserting that "...the programs (slices) [are] received as a plurality [of] sets by dividing the programs into categories." (Office Action, Pg. 3, Emphasis added). In the Office Action, the Examiner further indicates that "...the sets of slices [have] been interpreted by the examiner to be various categories...." (Office Action, Pg. 3). Applicants respectfully note, however, that Applicants' claim 18, as amended, further defines the sets of slices such that at least one of the sets of slices includes a plurality of slices for the respective plurality of slice locations of the guide region and, further, that multiple slices for each of the at least one slice location are received in different ones of the sets of slices. Applicants note that support for such limitations may at least be found in Figure 7A and Page 24, Lines 6-26 of Applicants' originally-filed application.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's characterization of sets of slices as categories of slices is incorrect. The inclusion of the category of each of the programs in the program data, as taught in Hayana (see Figure 12 of Hayana), has nothing to do with how slices are received, much less receiving slices as sets of slices. Rather, as taught in Hayana, the program category included in the program data for a program merely provides an indication as to the genre of the program. The mere fact that program data for multiple programs in the same genre may be received as part of the EPG data of Hayana, does not teach of suggest the sets of slices, as claimed in Applicants' claim 1. As such, Hayana fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claim 18, as a whole.

Furthermore, White fails to bridge the substantial gap between Hanaya and Applicants' claim 18.

In general, White discloses a system for providing program oriented information. Specifically, as taught in White, rather than presenting a program list that is oriented according to channel, White presents a program list that is oriented according to program. White, however, is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of the sets of slices as claimed in Applicants' claim 18. Specifically, White fails to teach or suggest that at least one of the sets of slices includes a plurality of slices associated with respective slice locations. Furthermore, White fails to teach or suggest that, for each of the at least one slice location for which multiple slices are received, the multiple slices are received in different ones of the sets of slices.

Rather, White is directed toward processing programming information for presenting the program information according to program, rather than channel. Specifically, White teaches that a program category is selected, programs in that program category are identified, the identified programs are sorted, and the identified programs in that program category are displayed. White, however, fails to teach or suggest how program data is received, much less that program data is received as a plurality of sets of slices. As such, White must also fail to teach or suggest that program data is received as a plurality of sets of slices as claimed in Applicants' claim 18. As such, White, alone or in combination with Hayana, fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claim 18.

The test under 35 U.S.C. §103 is not whether an improvement or a use set forth in a patent would have been obvious or non-obvious; rather the test is whether the claimed invention, considered as a whole, would have been obvious. Jones v. Hardy, 110 USPQ 1021, 1024 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added). Moreover, the invention as a whole is not restricted to the specific subject matter claimed, but also embraces its properties and the problem it solves. In re Wright, 6 USPQ 2d 1959, 1961 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (emphasis added). Hanaya and White, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest Applicants' claim 18, as a whole.

As such, Applicants submit that independent claim 18 is patentable over Hanaya and White under 35 U.S.C. §103. Similarly, Applicants' independent claim 28 recites

relevant limitations similar to those recited in independent claim 18 and, thus, for at least the same reasons discussed above, independent claim 28 also is patentable over Hanaya and White under 35 U.S.C. §103. Furthermore, claims 19, 21, 23-24, 26-27 and 29 depend from independent claim 18 or 28 and recite additional limitations thereof. Therefore, for at least the same reasons discussed above, these dependent claims also are patentable over Hanaya and White under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 20

The Examiner has rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanaya in view of White in further view of Ihara (U.S. Patent 6,266,813, hereinafter "Ihara"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 20 depends from independent claim 18 and recites additional limitations thereof. For at least the reasons discussed above, Hanaya and White, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest Applicants' claim 18, as a whole.

Furthermore, Ihara fails to bridge the substantial gap as between Hanaya and White and Applicants' claim 18.

In general, Ihara teaches a digital broadcasting system for transmitting television programs from a primary transmission system, such as a digital satellite broadcasting system, to a secondary transmission system, such as a cable television system. As disclosed in Ihara, the secondary transmission system reedits and rebroadcasts the programs, and may rearrange the air time at which the programs received from the primary transmission system are rebroadcast in the secondary transmission system. The secondary transmission system changes the air time at which programs received from the primary transmission system are rebroadcast in the secondary transmission system using change information transmitted from the primary transmission system to the secondary transmission system in advance of the scheduled air time of the programs. (Ihara, Abstract; Col. 1, Lines 6-10).

Ihara, however, is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of how the data for the electronic program guide is provided to the user's location for display. Specifically, Ihara

is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of any sets of slices, much less that at least one of the sets of slices includes a plurality of slices associated with the respective plurality of slice locations in the guide region, or that multiple slices for each of the at least one slice location are received in different ones of the sets of slices, as claimed in Applicants' claim 18.

Rather, Ihara discloses distribution of change information indicating changes in the content of broadcasting, such as prolongation of air time of a particular television program. More specifically, Ihara discloses that change information may be sent from the first transmission system to the second transmission system in order to enable the second transmission system to change the time at which a program is aired.

As such, Ihara fails to teach or suggest at least the limitations of "wherein at least one of the sets of slices includes a plurality of slices associated with the respective plurality of slice locations in the guide region, wherein multiple slices for each of the at least one slice location are received in different ones of the sets of slices," as claimed in Applicants' claim 18.

Therefore, Hanaya, White, and Ihara, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest Applicants' claim 18, as a whole.

Thus, Applicants submit that independent claim 18 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Hanaya in view of White in further view of Ihara. Therefore, Applicants submit that dependent claim 20 is also patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Hanaya in view of White in further view of Ihara.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Thus, Applicants submit that none of the claims presently in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Michael Bentley or Eamon J. Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/19/07

Eamon J. Wall, Attorney
Registration No. 39,414
Attorney for Applicants

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
Telephone: 732-530-9404
Facsimile: 732-530-9808